REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 and 24-35 are pending. In the previous Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 24-35 including independent claims under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over RFC 791: Internet Protocol-DARPA Internet Program Protocol Specification (hereafter RFC 791), the "applicant's disclosure of prior art", and US Patent No. 7,149,769 (Lubber). The Examiner has considered Applicant arguments and has found them to be persuasive. The Examiner is now rejecting the claims under new grounds. Claims 1-11 and 24-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over RFC 791 in view of applicant's disclosure of prior art, further in view of Lubber, and further in view of Scheible, "Limited ELS Buffer Proposal."

The independent claims recite "sending a Process Login (PLOGI) message to a target entity, wherein the PLOGI process allows a source entity and the target entity to determine that an authentication message has a length that exceeds an authentication the message length supported by the target entity in a fibre channel Fabric[.]"

For example, "In this sequence, a PLOGI (Process Login) message is the initial exchange (Exchange a) between the initiating entity and the responding entity. The responding entity replies with a PLOGI Accept. The PLOGI process allows the two involved entities to negotiate the communication parameters which will be used in any subsequent communication between them. In this phase the two entities discover if one or both of them have some limitations in supporting ELSs." [0024]

The Examiner relies on Scheible to describe "sending a Process Login (PLOGI) message to a target entity, wherein the PLOGI process allows a source entity and the target entity to determine that an authentication message has a length that exceeds an authentication the message length supported by the target entity in a fibre channel Fabric."

Scheible states "Until recently, FC-FS (and FC-PH) had a default buffer size limitation of 128 bytes. However, many ELSs grew to exceed this amount and that created problems. The most obvious one was how can you issue a PLOGI/FLOGI that is either 116 or 256 bytes (and maybe more), when the default is 128 bytes (and cannot be changed until you issue the PLOGIIFLOGI)." Scheible notes a problem of issuing a "PLOGI/FLOGI that is either 116 or 256 bytes (and maybe more), when the default is 128 bytes." However, Scheible does not teach or suggest "sending a Process Login (PLOGI) message to a target entity, wherein the PLOGI process allows a source entity and the target entity to determine that an authentication message has a length that exceeds an authentication the message length supported by the target entity in a fibre channel Fabric."

In fact, Scheible proposes an entirely different solution. Scheibel proposes uses "a new ELS that does requires login and reports the buffer conditions in a port for both ELS and Data buffers." (see page 2 of Scheible) Scheible does not use the PLOGI message at all and instead uses a non-login related process. Consequently, even if there is sufficient motivation to combine the four reference cited by the Examiner, the four references either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest "sending a Process Login (PLOGI) message to a target entity, wherein the PLOGI process allows a source entity and the target entity to determine that an authentication message has a length that exceeds an authentication the message length supported by the target entity in a fibre channel Fabric[.]"

Furthermore, even if it is assumed that there is sufficient motivation to combine the references, the combined references still do not teach or suggest fragmenting an authentication message into a first message fragment and a second message fragment which are sent in different exchanges. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner proposed combination of references, even if sufficient motivation is assumed, would only teach fragmenting an ELS message. The fragments of the message would likely be transmitted in a single exchange without any suggestion that the fragments should be transmitted in different exchanges, with a second fragment not transmitted until a first exchange is complete. Conventional fragmentation mechanisms do not make separate first exchange and second exchange distinctions and do not send a second fragment upon "determining" that the first exchange is complete.

In light of the above remarks, the rejections to the independent claims are believed overcome for at least the reasons noted above. Applicants' Representative believes that all pending claims are allowable in their present form. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns for Applicants' Representative, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the Undersigned at the number provided below. If any additional fees are due in connection with this filing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account 504480 (Order No. ANDIP030).

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/Audrey Kwan/

G. Audrey Kwan
Reg. No. 46,850

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100